

REMARKS

Claims 11-18 and 21 remain in the application for consideration with the Examiner with Claims 1-10, 19 and 20 standing withdrawn from consideration.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and following remarks.

Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite.

Claim 21 has been amended, taking into consideration the helpful comments of the Examiner set forth in the Office Action.

It is respectfully submitted that Claims 11-18 and 21 are in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph and particularly point out and distinctly claims the subject matter which the Applicants believe is their invention.

Turning now to the art rejections, Claims 11-13, 16-18, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Suzuki;

Claims 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable under Suzuki in view of official notice.

These rejections are respectively traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that Suzuki does not disclose or suggest the presently claimed invention including a model reference control technique based on control characteristics of the hard disk drive as defined in independent Claim 11.

The Examiner alleges that Suzuki discloses a digital signal processor which operates as set forth in the claims. However, Suzuki discloses that column 5 lines 26-31 that the digital signal processor 50 computes a current value to be applied to the voice coil motor 63 in order to position the servo head 31 to the desired track on the basis of the difference between the computed moving velocity of the servo head 31 and the target value responsive to the remaining number of tracks until the target track.

The above described technique is not a model reference control technique based on the control characteristics of the hard disk drive. Consequently, applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's contentions are without merit.

With respect to the Examiner's use of official notice, the Examiner alleges that it is notoriously well known in the art to integrate plural circuits into a single semiconductor chip. Applicants respectively traverse the allegations of the Examiner and request a teaching from the prior art to substantiate these allegations.

It is respectfully submitted that Claims 11-18, and 21 define over the applied art.

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

While it is believed that the instant response places the application in condition for allowance, should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned in order to expeditiously resolve any outstanding issues.

To the extent necessary, Applicant petitions for an Extension of Time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any fees in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to the deposit account of Texas Instruments Incorporated, Account No. 20-0668.

Respectfully submitted,



W. Daniel Swayze, Jr.
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 34,478

Texas Instruments Incorporated
P.O. Box 655474, MS 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
(972) 917-5633